

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

09/924,743

Applicant(s)

ROSS, MARK

Examiner

Jessica L. Rossi

Art Unit

1733

All Participants:(1) Jessica L. Rossi.(2) Mr. Rothenberger.**Status of Application:** _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 24 May 2004**Time:** _____**Type of Interview:**

Telephonic



Video Conference

Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:***Discussed restriction requirement. Applicant orally elected Group I, claims 1-29 (see attached restriction), which belong in class 29.***Part III.**

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


(Examiner/SPE Signature)_____
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-29, drawn to a method for protecting a screen of an electronic device, classified in class 29, subclass 428.
 - II. Claim 30, drawn to a packaged protective film, classified in class 428, subclass 98.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

2. Inventions I and II are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case, the process can be used to make a product without instructions for placement thereof.
3. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
4. During a telephone conversation with Mr. Rothenberger on 5/24/04 a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-29. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claim 30 is withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.